

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,271	<u> </u>	11/07/2001	Scott W. Huffer	9325-58 (153520) 7750	
35811	7590	04/03/2006		EXAMINER	
		PIPER RUDNIC	YAN, REN LUO		
1650 MARKET ST SUITE 4900 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2854	

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			<
		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/037,271	HUFFER, SCOTT W.
		Examiner	Art Unit
	The MAILING DATE of this communication and	Ren L. Yan	2854
Period fo	 The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply 	lears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
WHI - Exte after - If NO - Failt Any	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAPAISATIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
2a)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 De</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.	
Disposit	tion of Claims		
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-7 and 10-14 is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-7 and 10-14 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	
Applicat	tion Papers		
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the liderawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12)□ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachmer	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary	(PTO-413)
2) Notice 3) Information	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	

Art Unit: 2854

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12-5-2005 has been entered.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 2854

Claims 1-7 and 10-14 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,546,872 in view of Kawahata et al(5,019,202).

Claims 1-11 of the patent teaches the exact printing process as claimed including all of the steps as recited except for the coating being cured by electron beam processing. Kawahata et al teach in a similar printing process the conventional use of electron beam process to cure a coating. See the paragraph bridging columns 11 and 12 in Kawahata et al for example. It would have been obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the printing process in claims 1-11 of the patent with the electron beam process as taught by Kawahata et al in order to more effectively cure the coating layer so as to obtain a desired appearance of the printed product.

Claims 1-7 and 10-14 would be allowed if the above obviousness double patenting rejection was overcome in applicant's next response to this Office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ren L. Yan whose telephone number is 571-272-2173. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on 571-272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2854

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ren L Yan

Primary Examiner Art Unit 2854

Ren Yan

March 30, 2006